

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Applicant has editorially amended the claims for clarity. Applicants have added new claim 23 to claim additional features of the invention and to provide varied protection for the claimed invention.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicants specifically state that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 4 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten independent form. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that all of claims 1-23 are allowable.

Claims 1-3, 5-14, and 16-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maurinus et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,646; hereinafter "Maurinus") in view of Doi (U.S. Patent No. 6,938,066) and Hanabusa et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0145752; hereinafter "Hanabusa").

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

The claimed invention (e.g., as defined in claim 1) is directed to a print service system for providing a print service based on digital image information in an amusement park.

The system includes a print service server connected to a network and a digital camera that has a communication function and is connected to the print service server via the network. The digital camera transmits digital image information to be printed and order

information including receipt information indicating a spot for receiving a print to the print service server via the network. The print service server, which is accessible to a database storing information about attractions in the amusement park, transmits candidate information of receiving spots including receivable time information and the information about attractions corresponding to the candidate information to the digital camera prior to receiving the receipt information based on existing position information of the digital camera, and also transmits print instruction information including the digital image information received from the digital camera to a printing device provided in a spot that corresponds to the receipt information received from the digital camera (e.g., see Application at paragraph [0008]).

Accordingly, the claimed invention provides an effective print service in an amusement park and allows a user to obtain a print of an image quickly while enjoying attractions in the amusement park (see Application at paragraphs [0007] and [0009]).

II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

The Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Maurinus with Doi and Hanabusa to render obvious the claimed invention of claims 1-3, 5-14, and 16-22. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each feature of the claimed invention.

That is, neither Maurinus, nor Doi, nor Hanabusa (nor any combination thereof) teaches or suggests “*wherein the print service server, which is accessible to a database storing information about attractions in the amusement park, transmits candidate information of receiving spots including receivable time information and the information about attractions corresponding to the candidate information to the digital camera prior to receiving the receipt information based on existing position information of the digital*

camera” (emphasis added), as recited in exemplary claim 1, and similarly recited in exemplary claim 12.

The Examiner concedes that Maurinus does not disclose a print server that “transmits candidate information of receiving spots including receivable time information and the information.” (See Office Action dated June 25, 2007 at page 3).

The Examiner, however, alleges that Doi teaches this feature of the claimed invention. Indeed, the Examiner alleges that Doi teaches a print server, which “transmits candidate information of receiving spots including receivable time information.” (See Office Action dated June 25, 2007 at page 3). Applicants submit, however, that Doi does not teach or suggest this feature of the claimed invention.

Doi is directed to a customer navigation system for guiding a customer through a facility. Doi teaches determining a location of a customer in a facility, such as an amusement park, and providing information about the attractions in the facility. For example, Doi may provide a customer with information regarding location and wait times of attractions in the facility and suggestions for alternative attractions for the customer (e.g., see Doi at column 9, lines 33-66).

Doi, however, is not directed to a photo imaging system nor a system that allows a customer to order and retrieve a print of a photo image.

In the claimed invention, however, the print server transmits candidate information of receiving spots including (1) receivable time information and the (2) information about attractions corresponding to the candidate information to the digital camera prior.

Doi, however, merely provides information about the attractions. Doi does not transmit receivable time information for a print of a photo image. Indeed, as detailed above, Doi is not directed to a system for providing prints of photo images.

Accordingly, Doi fails to make up the deficiencies of Maurinus.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that Hanabusa also fails to make up the deficiencies of Maurinus.

That is, Hanabusa does not teach or suggest a print server that transmits candidate information of receiving spots including receivable time information and the information about attractions corresponding to the candidate information to the digital camera prior.

Indeed, the Examiner does not even allege that Hanabusa teaches or suggests this feature of the claimed invention.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the alleged combination of references fails to teach or suggest every feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

III. NEW CLAIM

Applicants have added new claim 23 to claim additional features of the invention and to provide more varied protection for the claimed invention. This claim is independently patentable because of the novel and nonobvious features recited therein.

New claim 23 is patentable over any combination of the cited references at least based on analogous reasons to those set forth above with respect to claims 1-22.

IV. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-23, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, Applicants request the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number

listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

Applicants authorize the Commissioner to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: September 25, 2007



Scott M. Tulino, Esq.
Registration No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PLLC**

8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200

Vienna, VA 22182-3817

(703) 761-4100

Customer No. 21254